

REMARKS

Claims 1,4, 5, 13, 15-21, 23-27 and 30-33 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein;

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 4 and 32 stand objected to for certain informalities which do not effect the patentability of the present application. Applicant has amended these claims to correct the informalities. Therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner asserts that recently added claim limitation "a resistance element disposed between the pair of substrates" is not supported by the specification as originally filed. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Instead of being disposed on the objecting portion of the transparent substrate 1a, it is envisioned that the peripheral circuit (including resistors) may be disposed on a portion of the transparent substrate which is sandwiched between the pair of transparent substrates 1a, 1b as shown in Figure 9 (see also first paragraph on page 27 of the specification as originally filed). In this way, the objecting portion of the transparent substrate 1a does not need to be increased in size. Therefore, Applicant

Serial No. 09/202,107

Page 10 of 14

asserts that the subject matter was sufficiently described in the specification as originally filed and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the resistance element and capacitor are not shown disposed between the substrates and connected to the liquid crystal drive IC. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant asserts that basis for this claimed subject matter may be found throughout the application as originally filed. Specifically, basis may be found at in Figure 9 and accompanying description found on page 27 of the specification as discussed above. It should be noted that these portions of the specification have been previously amended to more clearly describe this aspect of the invention, but no new matter has been added to the application as originally filed. To the extent that these portions were not clear as to the peripheral circuit having a resistor and a capacitor, further support for this claimed subject matter may be found in Claim 20 which was introduced via a preliminary amendment concurrently with the filing of the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Serial No. 09/202,107

Page 11 of 14

Received from <248 641 0270> at 7/30/03 1:36:46 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4, 5, 13, 15-18, 20, 21, 23, 25-27 and 30-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,289,301 (Brewer) in view of Japanese Patent Document JP 8-148313 (Yuda). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Brewer is directed generally to a liquid crystal display device. Of particular interest, Brewer discloses an electronic control module 9 which includes an integrated circuit 10 and a resistor element 19 or 22. However, Applicant notes that the resistor elements 19 or 22 are not formed to a prescribed pattern, such that the resistance value of the resistance element is capable of being set by partially removing the pattern of the resistance element.

Brewer is directed generally to a liquid crystal display device. Of particular interest, Brewer discloses an electronic control module 9 which includes an integrated circuit 10 and a resistor element 19 or 22. As noted by the Examiner, Brewer does not disclose that the resistor elements 19 or 22 are formed to a prescribed pattern, such that the resistance value of the resistance element is capable of being set by partially removing the pattern of the resistance element as recited in Applicant's claimed invention.

The Examiner then relies on Yuda to teach this aspect of Applicant's claimed invention. Yuda is directed generally to a variable resistor having resistance pattern 2. However, to adjust the resistance value, a brush 35 is slid between point A and point C. Therefore, Yuda does not teach or suggest a resistor element whose value may be set by partially removing the pattern of the resistance element as recited in Applicant's claimed invention.

Applicant's claimed invention is also directed to a liquid crystal display device. The liquid crystal display device generally includes a liquid crystal disposed between a pair of substrates. However, Claim 1 recites "a resistance element having an adjustable resistance value, disposed on at least one of the pair of substrates, ..., the resistance element having the same material as that of the at least one electrode and formed to a prescribed pattern" Additionally, Claim 1 recites "the resistance value of said resistance element is capable of being set by partially removing the pattern of the resistance element" in combination with the other elements recited in the claim. In this way, the voltage supplied to the liquid crystal display device by the host equipment may be fixed to a given voltage, and yet the voltage imposed on the liquid crystal can be adjusted to a prescribed value which is suitable to operate the liquid crystal. The Applicant's claimed technique for adjusting the resistance value of the resistance element is not taught or suggested by the relied upon reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1, along with claims depending therefrom, defines patentable subject matter over Brewer. Applicant notes that independent Claims 5, 13, 21 and 31 recite similar subject matter, and thus should be allowable, along with claims depending therefrom, for the same reasons as Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

DRAFT

Dated: July _____, 2003

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/TDM/mas

By: _____

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344
Attorneys for Applicants

Serial No. 09/202,107

Page 14 of 14

Received from < 248 641 0270 > at 7/30/03 1:36:46 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]